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**Izvleček**

V prispevku avtor navaja nekatere nove ugotovitve o rimski cesti in cestnih postajah ob cesti Siscia–Sirmium vzdolž reke Save, izpričani na Tabuli Peutingeriani in Antoninskom itinerariju. Rezultat primerjave razdalj med naselbinama, omenjenima v obeh itinerarijih, je poskus nove datacije obeh antičnih kartografskih virov. V diskusiji je izpostavljen problem toponima "Incero sed mansio augusti in pretorio est" na Antoninskem itinerariju, primerljiv s cestno postajo Ad Praetorium/Praetorium na Tabuli Peutingeriani. Po mnenju avtorja obstajajo trdni argumenti, da se traso vzdolž reke Save uvrsti med eno najzgodnejših cestnih povezav v Panoniji. Cesta je bila osnovana kot vojaška komunikacija, a je kmalu postala ena najpomembnejših povezav Italije z Balkanom. Brez dvoma je pomenila močno prometnico in cestne postaje vzdolž nje so v poznejšem obdobju ponujale potrebno oskrbo za javni transportni sistem. To se jasno izraža na Antoninovem itinerariju.
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**Abstract**

Our contribution considers some data from the Peutinger map and the Antonine itinerary, regarding the mentioning of the Roman road and the stations along this road between the settlements Siscia and Sirmium, along the River Sava. To obtain new results regarding the dating of these two important ancient cartographic sources, I have compared the values of the distances between the settlements recorded in both these itineraries. I have also launched a discussion concerning the mentioning in the Antonine itinerary of the toponym *Incero sed mansio augusti in pretorio est*, comparable with Ad Praetorium/ Praetorium, recorded in the Peutinger map. In conclusion, I suggested that there are solid arguments in favour of rating the road along the River Sava as one of the earliest routes in Pannonia. Initially, it was a military communication artery, and, as in the whole of the Roman Empire, it became one of the important routes connecting Italy to the Balkans. It was clearly used intensively, and in the late period stations along this road served to supply the infrastructure necessary for the official transportation system. This late state of affairs is reflected in the Antonine itinerary.
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1. PREMISES

Almost 130 years have passed since the first publication of a study focused on one of the most debated artefacts of the Roman world: the Peutinger map. Since then, scientific interest regarding ancient geography has fluctuated. Only after the 1970s did interest on the geography of the Romans moved from amateurs’ map collections towards a scientific approach. The debates are ongoing, as recent books focused on these topics prove.2

In 2011, I started research focused on three Roman provinces: Pannonia, Dacia and Moesia, with direct reference to two important ancient geographical sources: the Peutinger map and the Antonine itinerary. The idea for this research originated from several fundamental questions: 1) Do the Peutinger map and the Antonine itinerary offer different information related to Pannonia, Dacia and Moesia? 2) How can this be established? 3) How did other late sources, such as the Notitia Dignitatum, the Bordeaux itinerary, or the Cosmography of the Anonymous from Ravenna, present or describe these regions? 4) How were the Peutinger map and the Antonine itinerary compiled? 5) By analysing these provinces, can new information useful to dating the above-mentioned documents be obtained? 6) Thus far, in order to date these documents, historians have discussed them as a whole or separately, focusing on small, sometimes insignificant details from certain areas. What other methodological criteria or means can be employed, beside the conventional, established methods, to provide new data? 7) Can we differentiate between the purpose of the Peutinger map and the Antonine itinerary? 8) Supposing that new dating criteria can be identified, will they be useful for further research and could this method be applied to other regions, and finally to all former Roman provinces? 9) The Peutinger map and the Antonine itinerary each list around 2700 settlements. Can these two documents be compared by analysing the presence or the absence of certain settlements, in order to date the documents?

2. PANNONIA. THE MODEL OF CONQUEST. SISCIA AND THE RIVER SAVA: THEIR HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE

The events and military actions preceding the conquest of Pannonia and its transformation into a Roman province, and the history of some major cities in Pannonia (Siscia,3 Sirmium4), are quite well recorded by ancient sources5 and by a large number of articles6 and books7 focused on these issues.

Pannonia first gained the attention of the Romans in 35–33 B.C. During this period, the inhabitants of these regions, the Pannonii, allies of the Dalmatians, were attacked by the Romans, who conquered and occupied Siscia (Sisak, in Croatia).9 Before that, the Roman interest in this area had focused exclusively on economic resources (silver and iron).10 The ancient sources provide information regarding this war against the Pannonii. Appian mentions all the populations east of the Alps: Sallasoi, Iapodes, Segestanoi, Dalmatai, Daisititai and Paiones.11 Cassius Dio provides a short list of the populations involved in this event.12

---

3 Šašel 1974.
4 Mirković 1971.
5 According to Kovács 2014, 26–27, ancient sources do not mention anything about Illyricum and Pannonia for a decade, until 16 B.C. Then, when the Pannons started the conflict with the Romans, ancient sources recorded some of the events (including the Pannonian War, Bellum Pannonicum from 12–11B.C.). In comparison, the other major military events, Bellum Batonianum, or the Pannon-Dalmatian revolt, is recorded by many ancient authors, including Velleius Paterculus, The Roman History II.110–116; Cassius Dio, Roman History 55.28.7–34, 56.11–17.2 and others. Details in Kovács 2014, 31.
11 Appian, Illyrié 17; about the Pannonians in Appian’s Illyrié: Šašel Kos 2004.
12 Cassius Dio, Roman History 49,34.2; Nemeth 2007, 131. Dio is the main source concerning Octavian’s actions in Illyricum. He is an excellent source also for the Dalmatian-Pannonian rebellion, as suggested by Kovács 2014, 31.
Appian observed that the conquest of Siscia and of the valley of the River Sava was motivated by Octavian’s desire to use Siscia and the river itself as a military base in a future war against the Dacians and the Bastarni.\footnote{Appian, Illyriké 22; Nemeth 2007, 32. For a detailed analysis of Appian’s text: Dzino 2016, 69–83.}

Strabo describes Siscia as a place that, due to its location, was very suitable as a base for military action against the Dacians.\footnote{Strabo, Geography 7,5,2.} Cassius Dio suggests that Octavian had no criticism against the Panonii, because they did not harm the Romans.\footnote{Cassius Dio, Roman History 49,36,1,2.} He continues with a description of this conflict.\footnote{Cassius Dio, Roman History 49,37,1–6.} According to Cassius Dio, this expedition was organized in order to train the soldiers. Specialists agree with these two ancient sources; some of them accepted Appian’s version.\footnote{Tóth 2003, 19.} Mócsy understood the conquest of Siscia as an action related to Augustan propaganda.\footnote{Mócsy 1974, 32–33.} In fact, if one looks more closely, the true purpose was, as observed by Mócsy, the creation of a land connection between northern Italy and the Roman territories in the Balkans, but also the pacification of the neighbouring population in north-eastern Italy.\footnote{Mócsy 1974, 80.}

The conquest of Siscia and parts of the Sava valley served to create not only a land connection between Italy and the Balkans, but also a strategic point for a future conflict with the Dacians, even if such a war was not yet included in Roman plans. Strabo mentions that the road connecting Aquileia with the Danube passed through Siscia and Sirmium.\footnote{Strabo, Geography 7,5,2.}

After this conquest, sources remain silent until 16 B.C. Cassius Dio states that Macedonia was attacked by the Scordisci.\footnote{Cassius Dio, Roman History 49,37,1–6.} Tiberius acted against the Panonians in the subsequent year, 15 B.C.\footnote{Cassius Dio, Roman History 49,36,1,2.} The rebellions of the Panonians, who sometimes had the Dalmatians as allies, continued over the following years: 14, 13, 12, 11, 9, and 8 B.C.\footnote{Cassius Dio, Roman History 54,20,3.} Some of these events were recorded by Velleius Paterculus.\footnote{Velleius Paterculus, The Roman History 2,96.}

In the beginning, Agrippa and Marcus Vinicius were in charge of the military operations. After Agrippa’s death, operations were led by Tiberius. Even Augustus came to Aquileia. The measures taken by the Romans after this intensive conflict were very harsh; for example, most of the young men were captured and sold as slaves.\footnote{Mócsy 1974, 34; Cassius Dio, Roman History 54.34.4.} In 11 B.C., Illyricum was constituted as an imperial province,\footnote{About this episode: Dzino 2009, 4; Šašel Kos 2013.} after the Bellum Pannonicum.\footnote{Dzino 2010, 4; Šašel Kos 2013.} It included the area of what was later to become Dalmatia and Pannonia. The Danube came to be the northern limit of this vast area.\footnote{Mócsy 1974, 32.}

Pannonia was founded as an imperial province of consular rank under the initial name of Illyricum inferius some time after the defeat of the Dalmatian-Pannonian rebellion of 6–9 A.D.\footnote{About this episode: Dzino 2006; Dizdar 2010; Nemeth 2007, 141.} It stretched to the northern and the eastern part of the Danube.\footnote{Dzino 2006; Dizdar 2010; Nemeth 2007, 141.} The archaeological evidence indicates that under Augustus the Roman occupation army was positioned only in the southern part of the province, i.e. in the Sava-Drava area. The occupation of the northern part happened later, in the Tiberian-Claudian period. First, the legio XV Apollinaris was sent to Carnuntum.\footnote{Radman-Livaja, Roman History 54.34.4.} Many auxiliary troops were installed along the Amber Road. At this stage the Danube defence was also strengthened by auxiliary troops. They were settled in Arrabona (Győr) and Brigetio (Komárom-Szöny). Under the Flavian emperors, the entire Pannonian army was moved to the Danubian frontier.\footnote{Radman-Livaja, Roman History 54.34.4.} Both Vespasian and Trajan continued to consolidate the lines and the military defence in Pannonia as well as in neighbouring Noricum.

As a single province, until Trajan’s reign, Pannonia included territories from the Drava-Sava interfluve (the western half of present-day Hungary), the Vienna Basin, the Burgenland, to parts of Austria, Croatia, Serbia, Slovenia, Slovakia and Bosnia. Between 102 and 106 A.D., Trajan divided...
the province into Pannonia Superior and Inferior. In Pannonia Superior, located upstream on the Danube, three legions were stationed. In Pannonia Inferior, located to the south-east, only one legion was garrisoned, in Aquincum. In 214 A.D., Caracalla modified the demarcation lines between the two provinces. Starting with Caracalla’s reign, Brigetio, the garrison of the legio I Adiutrix, was administratively assigned to Pannonia Inferior. The civilian settlement, located circa 2 km west of the military fort, was granted the status of municipium under Caracalla. Soon it was promoted to the rank of colonia. The rank of the governors of the Pannonian provinces varied according to the number of legions under their command. The governor of Pannonia Superior was of consular rank. His headquarters were in Carnuntum. Until Caracalla, the governor of Pannonia Inferior, based at Aquincum, was a praetorian, having only one legion under his command.

3. THE PEUTINGER MAP AND THE ANTONINE ITINERARY: WHEN AND HOW WERE THEY CREATED? METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS

The most important contributions on the Peutinger map are the books by Miller, Levi and Levi, Weber, Bosio and Talbert’s monograph. The most recent books were published in 2014 by Emily Albu and in 2016 by Michael Rathmann. In addition to these, there are many articles and book chapters discussing various aspects of the map’s history, dating, design, and character. All these are useful in understanding the complexity of this document.

The document kept today in the National Library of Austria is a copy of another map, created during the late Roman period. The dating of the original map remains, in my opinion, an unresolved issue. Dozens of attempts have been made to date it. Some historians dated the original document to the late 3rd, 4th, 5th centuries A.D. Others wrote that it was created in the third century, and then completed with other data in the 4th and 5th centuries A.D. Several historians tried to date the original, unsuccessfully, more accurate, in terms of years or short periods: around 250 A.D., after 260 A.D., during Diocletian’s Tetrarchy (c. 300 A.D.) in 365–366 A.D., between 402 and 452 A.D., in 435 A.D., or during ‘the fourth to fifth centuries’. Recently, Albu dated the original map in the early ninth century A.D. Suppositions about the map’s author, place and method of creation, dimensions, purpose, role, and sources used, were also produced. The map was thought to serve as a road map, reflecting the official transportation system (cursus publicus), or as a propaganda map, depicting the former glory, power, and geographical extent of the Roman Empire, during the Tetrarchy. The map was either ordered by a private citizen, or by an emperor (Septimius Severus, Theodosius II) and it either stood as a parchment roll in a library, or was displayed on a wall in Diocletian’s palace in Split (Spalatum).

Therefore, a simple question arises: how can one date such a document with such different chronological information? Can one explain the diverse data contained by the document? Both Pascaul Arnaud in 1988 and then Benet Salway in 2001 succeeded in explaining the diverse chronological frame of some details contained by the map. Itinerarium Antonini has had the same fate and has generated almost the same amount of literature.
as Peutinger's map has. Pascal Arnaud has noted the difficulty of dating the Itinerarium.57

Some fundamental and unsolved aspects regarding the Peutinger map and the Antonine itinerary are:
1 – their dating;
2 – the sources used by their authors;
3 – their connection with other documents.

In my opinion, the fundamental problem of these two itineraries is not their general dating. Obviously, the Peutinger map and the Antonine itinerary both include termini post quem that do not allow too many speculations. The representation, in the Peutinger map, of Constantinople or St. Peter's church, makes impossible the dating of the document before the beginning of the fourth century A.D. How then does one explain the presence of Dacia (Roman province from 106 A.D. to 271 A.D.) or the representation of Pompeii in the same cartographic document? The logical explanation is that the creator/s of the original document used regional maps (itineraria picta or adnotata) as sources for their map of the Roman world, but they did not update the information contained in these documents. The same reasons are available for the Antonine itinerary: several place-names were correctly dated at the end of the 3rd century and the beginning of the 4th century A.D. Therefore, I think that the main unsolved issues of these two documents are rather related to the detailed analysis of the information concerning each and every province, in order to obtain individual clues for dating the situation for each region. That is why, in my attempt to find other methodological solutions, I have decided to compare distances between the settlements. Further in this paper, I will analyse these, 8 distance figures are recorded between the same settlements. The frequency of these is: 8 (miles)–1 (time), 9–1, 17 distance figures. I will focus only on the segment starting from Emona, therefore my calculations will refer only to Pannonia.

From Emona, the settlements and distances are:


The total distance covered on the Peutinger map from Emona to Taurunum is 309 miles, i.e. 456.85 km. Along this road, 19 settlements are mentioned (I counted 19, Taurunum was already counted for the first road) and 17 distance figures. The frequency of these is: 8 (miles)–1 (time), 9–1, 10–1, 10–1, 14–3, 16–2, 18–4, 20–2, 30–1, 33–2. Out of these, 8 distance figures are recorded between the

values of 8 to 16 miles. This means that out of 17 distance figures 8 represent 47.05%. Along this route, the distances are slightly longer compared to those along the first road. If I also include the distance figure of 18 (4), the percentage increases to 12/17, which is 70.58%.

Strategically and economically, this road was very important for Pannonia. During Augustus’ reign, Aquileia, Emona66 and Siscia67 were the most important settlements. They were used as military bases for the army. Nemeth observed, in the text of Appian, Octavian’s desire to use Siscia and the river itself as a military base in a future war against the Dacians and the Bastarni.68 Mócsy suggested that the conquest of Siscia may be perceived as related to Augustan propaganda.69 Strabo was convinced that Siscia was well chosen as a military base for future actions against the Dacians.70 When the rebellion of 6–9 A.D. started, the people north of the Sava did not participate. The efficiency of the Roman strategy was outstanding. By controlling the River Sava, along the road discussed above, the Romans succeeded to conquer the northern area quickly, up to the Sava, and then the whole region up to the Danube. Therefore, in my opinion, the Emona–Siscia–Taurunum road was probably represented in an early itinerarium, initially created by the army. The same mechanism was implemented in Dacia, where the road from Lederata to Tibiscum was built during Trajan’s military campaigns in Dacia.

Along this route, five settlements are marked by ‘double-tower’ type vignettes: Emona, Adprotorium, Siscia, Sirmium and Taurunum. The most interesting case is Adprotorium (Praetorium Latobicorum), an important settlement on this road, which belonged to the territory of Neviodunum.71

5. ‘ITEM AB HEMONA PER SISCIAM SIRMI’. THE ROAD ALONG THE RIVER SAVA IN THE ANTONINE ITINERARY

Across a total distance of 310 miles fourteen settlements are listed in the Antonine itinerary. The frequency of the distance figures in the Antonine itinerary for this road is: 15 (miles) – 1 (time); 22 – 2; 23 – 1; 25 – 1; 26 – 2; 28 – 2; 29 – 1; 31 – 1; 34 – 1.

Data related to the Emona–Adprotorium sector reveal, yet again, that the Peutinger map and the Antonine itinerary rely on different sources. The Peutinger map mentions: Emona (vignette)–XVIII–Acervone–XIII–Adprotorium (vignette), thus a total distance of 32 miles. The Antonine itinerary lists: Hemono–no distance figure–Praetorio Latovoricum. Further on, some distances match, but the Antonine itinerary mentions few settlements. From Adprotorium to Siscia, in the Antonine itinerary the road maps depict seven settlements, while the Antonine itinerary lists only four. Divided into sub-segments, the situation is the following: 1) TP: Adprotorium–XVI–Crucio–XVI–Noviodum (32 miles) vs. ItAnt: Praetorium Latovoricum–XXXIIII–Novioduno (34 miles); 2) TP: Noviodium–X–Romula–14–Quadrata (24 miles) vs. ItAnt: Novioduno–XXXI–Quadrato; 3) TP: Quadrata–XIII–Ad fines–XX–Siscia (vignette) (34) vs. ItAnt: Quadrato–XXVIII–Siscia. The distance figures, however, are close in their values.


65 A detailed topographical and archaeological description of this road, including the analysis of data from the Peutinger map at Bojanovski 1984.
67 Lolić 2003, 131–152.
68 Appianos, Illyriké, 22; Nemeth 2007, 32.
69 Mócsy 1974, 32–33.
70 Strabo, Geography VII, 5, 2.
71 Horvat 1999, 228.
6. AD PRAETORIUM IN THE ANCIENT GEOGRAPHICAL AND EPIGRAPHIC SOURCES

According to Talbert’s database, there are four toponyms derived from the form Ad Praetorium/Praetorium: 1. Ad Pretorivm (segment grid 4C1), between Cerva and Presididiole; 2. Ad Pretorium (4A5, symbol C10), between Siscia and Servtio, in Pannonia; 3. Adpretorum (5A1, symbol C1), between an unnamed/illegible settlement (no. 36) and Lorano; 4. Adprotoriu (4A2, symbol Ab19).

The other category consists of toponyms derived from Praetorium (without the particle Ad). Based on information from the same database, there are seven place-names derived from it, of which four are Pretorio, one is Pretoriu Agrippinae, one is Pretorium and one is longer, Pretorium Laverianum Nuceri(a)e Apul(a)e. Their characteristics are:

1 – Pretorio (name, no symbol, 8C2), between a settlement unnamed/illegible, no. 55 and P[ - ? - ]scv;
2 – Pretorio (name, no symbol, 1B2), between Ausrito and Argantomago/Acitodonum;
3 – Pretorio (name, no symbol, 6A4, in Dacia), between Admedia and Ad Pannonios;
4 – Pretorio (name, no symbol, 7A1, in Dacia), between Arutela and Ponte Vetere;
5 – Pretoriu Agrippine (symbol C2, 1A2), between Lugduno and Matilone;
6 – Pretorium (symbol C10), between Cerva and Presididiole;
7 – Pretorium (symbol C1), between Siscia and Servtio, in Pannonia;
8 – Pretorium Laverianum Nuceri(a)e Apul(a)e.

---

73 ‘This example of symbol class C10 is associated with Ad Pretorivm (4A5).’ This is Talbert’s observation at http://www.cambridge.org/us/talbert/talbertdatabase/symbolclass-C10.html. It is a unique drawing on the Peutinger map.
74 http://www.cambridge.org/us/talbert/talbertdatabase/symbolclass-Ab19.html: ‘Symbols conforming to this classification: [ - ? - ]desina (1A5); Adpretorivm (5A1); Aqvas Passaras (4B1); Aqvis (4C3); Aqvis calidis (9B2); Aqvis Nisicini (1B4); Mindo Fl. (4B2); Qvaeri (4A1); Tres Tabernas (5B1).’
75 http://www.cambridge.org/us/talbert/talbertdatabase/symbolclass-C1.html: ‘Symbols conforming to this classification: [ - ? - ]estis (2B1); Ad Aqvas casaris (3C4); Ad aqvis Hercvlis (3C1); Aqvis tavri (4B3); AQVIS BORMONIS (1B4); Aqvis Segete (1B5); Pretoriv Agrippine (1A2); (symbol, no name, no. 46) (6A4).’
6 – Pretorium (name, no symbol, 6C5), between Ad ficum and Putea nigra.\textsuperscript{81}

7 – Pretorium Laverianum Nucerii(a)e Apuli(a)e (symbol C19\textsuperscript{82}, 5B3), between Arpos and Aecas.\textsuperscript{83} To sum up, the place-names starting with ‘Ad ... / ‘At...’ are associated with vignettes marking mansiones (see Tres Tabernas, 5b1).

\textit{Incero sed mansio augusti in pretorio est}, listed in the Antonine itinera\textit{ry}, is also of interest. It designates a stopping point, not for everybody who travels, but for the emperor. The significance is to be contextualized, in my opinion, in the official transport system, \textit{cursus publicus}. Within this system, such stopping points were crucial in planning and making a journey using the official infrastructure (vehicles, horses, mansiones).

The toponym Ad Pretorium, the one after Siscia, is another interesting case. The ancient literary sources (Appian, Strabo) emphasize the strategic importance of Siscia as a base settlement used for controlling the River Sava and as a military base for a future war against the Dacians. In this context, the road connecting Italy to the Balkans, starting from Aquileia to Sirmium, became a strategic route from the very beginning of Octavian’s campaigns into the future Pannonia. Therefore, the presence of a placename such as Ad Pretorium close to Siscia represents a normal situation. It was there that a military base was installed. In time, it became an important stopover for travellers using the \textit{cursus publicus}. What I am attempting to suggest, here and further on, is that the Peutinger map was based on military sources, i.e. \textit{itineraria picta} initially created and used by the army. The Antonine itinerary was compiled using sources from the official archives of \textit{cursus publicus}.

Pretorium designated two types of constructions in Roman times. In its classical meaning, the term refers to a building inside a Roman fortress.\textsuperscript{84} During the military marches, \textit{praetorium} was the name of the tent of a Roman general. In the context of the \textit{cursus publicus}, the term designates a stopping point and the building used by the governor of a province or by high ranking officials.\textsuperscript{85} Another late meaning of this term is related to palaces, as opposed to agricultural structures (\textit{praetorium voluplati tantum deservientia}).\textsuperscript{86}

Some inscriptions also record this type of building, related to the transportation system. Much more numerous are the monuments concerning \textit{praetoria in castra}. Here are two examples. The first is an inscription from Dalmatia. It was found in Skradin (Croatia, ancient Scardona) and is dated to 177–180 A.D. The text reads:\textsuperscript{87}


Another inscription of this type, but much more interesting, was found in Dion (Colonia Iulia Augusta Diensis), in Greece, in the region of Kentrikí Makedonía.\textsuperscript{88} The text reads:


The inscriptions also record other facilities specific to the transportation system that served as stopping points within the \textit{cursus publicus}. Some of these are mansiones, stationes, and stabula.

Regarding the meaning of the term ‘praetorium’, apart from Pannonia, two toponyms are mentioned in Dacia. One is along the Dierna-Tibiscum road, between Admedia (today Bâile Herculane, Caraș-Severin County) and Ad Pannonios (Caraș-Severin County) and Ad Pannonios (Caraș-Severin County). This road, together with the Lederata-Tibiscum route, was designed and constructed during the two wars against the Dacians, between 101/102–105/106. The presence of the toponym Pretorio should be explained in close connection with the army, which was directly involved in

\textsuperscript{81} http://www.cambridge.org/us/talbert/talbertdatabase/TPPlace315.html.

\textsuperscript{82} http://www.cambridge.org/us/talbert/talbertdatabase/symbolclass-C19.html.

\textsuperscript{83} http://www.cambridge.org/us/talbert/talbertdatabase/TPPlace1337.html.

\textsuperscript{84} Daremberg, Saglio 1877–1919, tome 4, vol. 1 (N–Q), 640.

\textsuperscript{85} Daremberg, Saglio 1877–1919, tome 4, vol. 1 (N–Q), 642.

\textsuperscript{86} Daremberg, Saglio 1877–1919, tome 4, vol. 1 (N–Q), 642.

\textsuperscript{87} CIL III, 2809; Jagenteufel 1958, 48–49, no. 25.

\textsuperscript{88} AE 2000, 1295; Manils, Pascual 2005, 14, note 33.
the construction of these roads. In this context, pretorium means a stop-over used by high ranking officials of the Roman army. The second example from Dacia is Pretorio between Arutela (north of Păuşa, on the spot called Poiana Bivolari, Vâlcea County) and Ponte Vetere/Pons Vetus (Câineni, Vâlcea County), on the left bank of the River Olt. These settlements are all Roman auxiliary forts positioned from south to north along the valley of the River Olt, starting from the Danube up north, along the so-called *limes Alutanus*. The road which connected these forts was also designed and built during Trajan’s two wars against the Dacians.

7. FINAL REMARKS

To summarise, the mentioning of these toponyms indicates, in my opinion, that the maker of the Peutinger map used early documents of the *itineraria picta* type as documentation for his *magnum opus* both for Dacia and Pannonia. These sources were military records of the roads covered by the army. In the case of Pannonia, one can easily see that the route along the River Sava was constructed in early periods, perhaps starting with Octavian’s occupation of the area. The same mechanism may be identified in Dacia.

Concerning the place-name *Incero sed mansio Augusti in pretorio est* from the Antonine itiner-ary, it was located somewhere close to Vetovo, in Croatia. Ad Pretorium between Siscia and Servitio in the Peutinger map is to be found today, according to the *Barrington Atlas*,89 at Suva, near Bosanka Dubica, in Bosnia. Servitio is Bosanska Gradišk, and Urbate is Srbac, both also in Bosnia. All these settlements stretch across an area east–south-east of Siscia, and indicate a series of very important stopping points established early in the 1st century B.C. and developed afterwards, until the late Roman era, as the toponyms Varianis and Manneianis demonstrate.

In conclusion, I would suggest that there are solid arguments in favour of rating the road along the River Sava as one of the earliest routes in Pannonia. Initially, it was a military communication artery, and, as in the whole Roman Empire, it became one of the important routes connecting Italy to the Balkans. It was clearly used intensively and in the late period stations along this road served to supply the infrastructure necessary for the official transportation system. This late state of affairs is reflected in the Antonine itinerary.

89 Map 20, Pannonia-Dalmatia, 287.
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